

ON THE INDEX OF POWERS OF EDGE IDEALS

MINA BIGDELI, JÜRGEN HERZOG AND RASHID ZAARE-NAHANDI

ABSTRACT. The index of a graded ideal measures the number of linear steps in the graded minimal free resolution of the ideal. In this paper we study the index of powers and squarefree powers of edge ideals. Our results indicate that the index as a function of the power of an edge ideal I is strictly increasing if I has linear relations. Examples show that this need not to be the case for monomial ideals generated in degree greater than two.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years the study of algebraic and homological properties of powers of ideals has been one of the main subjects of research in Commutative Algebra. Generally speaking many of those properties, like for example depth, projective dimension or regularity stabilize for large powers (see [B], [Ca], [Ch], [CHT], [Co], [HH], [HW], [HHZ1], [HHZ2]), while their initial behavior is often quite mysterious, even for monomial ideals. However with many respects monomial ideals generated in degree 2 behave more controllable from the very beginning. So now let I be a monomial ideal generated in degree 2. The second author together with Hibi and Zheng showed in [HHZ2] that if I has a linear resolution, then all of its powers have a linear resolution as well. More recently there have been several interesting generalizations of this result. In case that I is squarefree, I may be viewed as the edge ideal of a finite simple graph G , and in this case Francisco, Hà and Van Tuyl raised the question whether I^k has a linear resolution for $k \geq 2$, assuming the complementary graph contains no induced 4-cycle, equivalently, G is gap free. However, Nevo and Peeva showed by an example [NP, Counterexample 1.10] that this is not always the case. On the other hand, Nevo [N] showed that I^2 has a linear resolution if G is gap and claw free, and Banerjee [B] gives a positive answer to the above question under the additional assumption that G is gap and cricket free. Here we should note that claw free implies cricket free.

In this paper we attempt to generalize the result of Hibi, Zheng and the second author of this paper in a different direction. An ideal I is called r steps linear, if I has a linear resolution up to homological degree r . In other words, if I is generated in a single degree, say d , and $\beta_{i,i+j}(I) = 0$ for all pairs (i, j) with $0 \leq i \leq r$ and $j > d$. The number

$$\text{index}(I) = \sup\{r : I \text{ is } r \text{ steps linear}\} + 1$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13D02, 13C13; Secondary 05E40.

Key words and phrases. edge ideals, resolutions, powers of ideals, index.

The paper was written while the first author was visiting the Department of Mathematics of University Duisburg-Essen. She wants to express her thanks for its hospitality.

is called the index of I . The main result of Section 2 (Theorem 2.1) is the following: Let I be a monomial ideal generated in degree 2. We interpret I as the edge ideal of a graph G which may also have loops (corresponding to squares among the monomial generators of I). Then the following conditions are equivalent: G is gap free, i.e. no induced subgraph of G consists of two disjoint edges, (b) $\text{index}(I^k) > 1$ for all k , (c) $\text{index}(I^k) > 1$ for some k .

Theorem 2.1 is not valid for monomial ideals generated in degree > 2 . There is an example by Conca [Co] of a monomial ideal I generated in degree 3 with linear resolution, that is, $\text{index}(I) = \infty$, and with the property that $\text{index}(I^2) = 1$.

Theorem 2.1 implies in particular that for a monomial ideal generated in degree 2 we have $\text{index}(I) = 1$ if and only if $\text{index}(I^k) = 1$ for all k . Again this fails if I is not generated in degree 2. Indeed, for $n \geq 4$ consider the ideal $I = (x^n, x^{n-1}y, y^{n-1}x, y^n)$. Then $\text{index}(I^k) = 1$ for $k = 1, \dots, n-3$ and $\text{index}(I^k) = \infty$ for $k > n-3$. There are also many such counterexamples of monomial ideals generated in degree 3.

The ideal I in the example of Nevo and Peeva has index 2, its square has index 7, while I^3 and I^4 have a linear resolution. This example and other experimental evidence leads us to conjecture that for a monomial ideal I generated in degree 2, one has $\text{index}(I^{k+1}) > \text{index}(I^k)$ for all k if $\text{index}(I) > 1$. This conjecture implies that $\text{index}(I^k) > k$ if $\text{index}(I) > 1$. In particular, if G is a graph (possibly with loops) on the vertex set $[n]$, this would imply that $I(G)^k$ has a linear resolution for $k > n-2$.

For the proof of our Theorem 2.1 we use the theory of lcm-lattices introduced by Gasharov, Peeva and Welker [GPW]. As an easy application of their theory the monomial ideals of index > 1 can be characterized by the fact that certain graphs associated with such ideals are connected. This criterion is used in the proof of Theorem 2.1.

If the index of a graded ideal is finite, then it is at most its projective dimension. In the case that $\text{index}(I) = \text{proj dim}(I)$ we say that I has maximal finite index. In Section 3 edge ideals of maximal finite index are classified. They turn out to be the edge ideals of the complement of a cycle, see Theorem 3.1. The essential tools to prove this result are Hochster's formula to compute the graded Betti numbers of a squarefree monomial ideal as well as the result of [EGHP, Theorem 2.1] in which the index of an edge ideal is characterized in terms of the underlying graph. As a consequence of Theorem 3.1 it is shown in Corollary 3.4 that all powers I^k for $k \geq 2$ have a linear resolution for an ideal of maximal finite index > 1 . This supports our conjecture that the index of the powers I^k of an edge ideal I is a strictly increasing function on k .

Our final Section 4 is devoted to the study of the index of the squarefree powers of edge ideals. The index of squarefree powers shows a quite different behavior than that of ordinary powers. Let I be the edge ideal of a finite graph G . We denote the k th squarefree power of I by $I^{[k]}$. It is clear that the unique minimal monomial set of generators of $I^{[k]}$ corresponds to the matchings of G of size k . In particular, if $\nu(G)$ denotes the matching number of G , that is maximal size of a matching of G , then $\nu(G)$ coincides with the maximal number k such that $I^{[k]} \neq 0$. In Theorem 4.1

we show that $I^{[\nu(G)]}$ always has linear quotients. In particular $\text{index}(I^{[\nu(G)]}) = \infty$ no matter whether or not $\text{index}(I) = 1$. Matchings with the property that one edge of the matching forms a gap with any other edge of the matching will be called a restricted matching. We denote by $\nu_0(G)$ the maximal size of a restricted matching of G . If there is no restricted matching we set $\nu_0(G) = 1$. There are examples which show that $\nu(G) - \nu_0(G)$ may be arbitrary large. However for trees one can see that $\nu_0(G) \geq \nu(G) - 1$. It is shown in Lemma 4.2 that $\text{index}(I^{[k]}) = 1$ for $k < \nu_0(G)$, and we conjecture that $\text{index}(I^{[k]}) > 1$ for all $k \geq \nu_0(G)$ and prove this conjecture in Theorem 4.4 for any cycle.

1. MONOMIAL IDEALS WITH INDEX > 1 .

Let K be a field, $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ the polynomial ring over K in n indeterminates, and let $I \subset S$ be a monomial ideal generated in degree d .

The ideal is called *r steps linear*, if I has a linear resolution up to homological degree r , in other words, if $\beta_{i,i+j}(I) = 0$ for all pairs (i, j) with $0 \leq i \leq r$ and $j > d$. Then the number

$$\text{index}(I) = \sup\{r : I \text{ is } r \text{ steps linear}\} + 1$$

is called the *index* of I . In particular, I has a linear resolution if and only if $\text{index}(I) = \infty$, and I is linearly related if and only if $\text{index}(I) > 1$.

In this section we derive a criterion for a monomial ideal to be linearly related. This criterion is actually an immediate consequence of the lcm-lattice formula [GPW] by Gasharov, Peeva and Welker for the multi-graded Betti numbers of a monomial ideal I , not necessarily generated in a single degree.

Let $G(I) = \{u_1, \dots, u_m\}$ be the unique minimal set of monomial generators of I . We denote by $L(I)$ the lcm-lattice of I , i.e. the poset whose elements are labeled by the least common multiples of subsets of monomials in $G(I)$ ordered by divisibility. The unique minimal element in $L(I)$ is 1. For any $u \in L(I)$ we denote by $(1, u)$ the open interval of $L(I)$ which by definition is the induced subposet of $L(I)$ with elements $v \in L(I)$ with $1 < v < u$. Furthermore, we denote by $\Delta((1, u))$ the order complex of the poset $(1, u)$.

The minimal graded free resolution of I is multi-graded. Identifying a monomial with its multi-degree we denote the multi-graded Betti numbers of I by $\beta_{i,u}(I)$ where i is the homological degree and u is a monomial. By Gasharov, Peeva and Welker one has

$$(1) \quad \beta_{i,u}(I) = \dim_K \tilde{H}_{i-1}(\Delta((1, u)); K) \quad \text{for all } i \geq 0 \text{ and all } u \in L(I).$$

Moreover, $\beta_{i,u}(I) = 0$ if $u \notin L(I)$.

Now suppose that all generators of I are of degree d . We define the graph G_I whose vertex set is $G(I)$ and for which $\{u, v\}$ is an edge of G_I if and only if $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) = d + 1$.

For all $u, v \in G(I)$ let $G_I^{(u,v)}$ be the induced subgraph of G_I with vertex set

$$V(G_I^{(u,v)}) = \{w : w \text{ divides } \text{lcm}(u, v)\}.$$

Proposition 1.1. *Let I be a monomial ideal generated in degree d . Then I is linearly related if and only if $G_I^{(u,v)}$ is connected for all $u, v \in G(I)$.*

Proof. By (1) the ideal I is linearly related if and only if all the open intervals $(1, w)$ with $w \in L(I)$ and $\deg w > d+1$ are connected. Considering the Taylor complex of I we see that $\beta_{1,w}(I) = 0$ if there exists no $u, v \in G(I)$ such that $w = \text{lcm}(u, v)$. Thus we need only to consider intervals $(1, w)$ with $w = \text{lcm}(u, v)$ for some $u, v \in G(I)$, and hence I is linearly related if and only if $\Delta((1, \text{lcm}(u, v)))$ is connected for all $u, v \in G(I)$ with $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) > d+1$.

We first assume that $G_I^{(u,v)}$ is connected for all $u, v \in G(I)$. Now let $u, v \in G(I)$ with $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) > d+1$. Let C and C' be maximal chains of the interval $(1, \text{lcm}(u, v))$ (i.e. facets of $\Delta((1, \text{lcm}(u, v)))$). For a chain D in $(1, \text{lcm}(u, v))$ we denote by $\min(D)$ the minimal element in D . Obviously, $\min(D) \in V(G_I^{(u,v)})$. Let $w = \min(C)$ and $w' = \min(C')$. Then $w, w' \in V(G_I^{(u,v)})$. Hence there exists a sequence $w_1, \dots, w_r \in V(G_I^{(u,v)})$ with $w = w_1$ and $w' = w_r$ and such that the degree of $v_j := \text{lcm}(w_j, w_{j+1})$ is $d+1$ for $j = 1, \dots, r-1$. Since v_j divides $\text{lcm}(u, v)$ and since $\deg v_j < \deg(\text{lcm}(u, v))$ it follows that $v_j \in (1, \text{lcm}(u, v))$. Thus there exist maximal chains C_j and D_j with $w_j, v_j \in C_j$ and $v_j, w_{j+1} \in D_j$. Consider the sequence of maximal chains

$$C, C_1, D_1, C_2, D_2, \dots, C_{r-1}, D_{r-1}, C'.$$

By construction any two successive chains in this sequence have a non-trivial intersection. This shows that $\Delta((1, \text{lcm}(u, v)))$ is connected.

Conversely, assume that $\Delta((1, \text{lcm}(u, v)))$ is connected for all $u, v \in G(I)$ with $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) > d+1$. By induction on $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v))$ we prove that $G_I^{(u,v)}$ is connected for all $u, v \in G(I)$ with $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) > d+1$.

In order to prove this, let $u, v \in G(I)$ with $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) > d+1$, and let $w, w' \in G_I^{(u,v)}$ with $w \neq w'$. There exist maximal chains C and D in $(1, \text{lcm}(u, v))$ with $\min(C) = w$ and $\min(D) = w'$. Since $\Delta((1, \text{lcm}(u, v)))$ is connected, there exist maximal chains $C_1, \dots, C_r$ in $\Delta((1, \text{lcm}(u, v)))$ with $C = C_1$ and $C_r = D$ and such that $C_j \cap C_{j+1} \neq \emptyset$ for $j = 1, \dots, r-1$. Let $w_j = \min(C_j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, r$. Let j be such that $w_j \neq w_{j+1}$. Then $d+1 \leq \deg(\text{lcm}(w_j, w_{j+1})) < \deg(\text{lcm}(u, v))$ because $\text{lcm}(w_j, w_{j+1})$ divides $\text{lcm}(u, v)$ and $\text{lcm}(w_j, w_{j+1}) \in (1, \text{lcm}(u, v))$ because $C_j \cap C_{j+1} \neq \emptyset$. If $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) = d+2$, it follows that $\deg(\text{lcm}(w_j, w_{j+1})) = d+1$ for all j with $w_j \neq w_{j+1}$. This shows that $G_I^{(u,v)}$ is connected whenever $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) = d+2$ and establishes the proof of the induction begin.

Suppose now that $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) > d+2$. Since $\Delta((1, \text{lcm}(w_j, w_{j+1})))$ is connected and $\deg(\text{lcm}(w_j, w_{j+1})) < \deg(\text{lcm}(u, v))$ we may apply our induction hypothesis and deduce that w_j and w_{j+1} are connected in $G_I^{(w_j, w_{j+1})}$. Since $G_I^{(w_j, w_{j+1})}$ is an induced subgraph of $G_I^{(u,v)}$ it follows that w_j and w_{j+1} are also connected in $G_I^{(u,v)}$. Finally, since $w = w_1$ and $w' = w_r$. It follows that $G_I^{(u,v)}$ is connected for all $u, v \in G(I)$ with $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) > d+1$. If $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) \leq d+1$, then $G_I^{(u,v)}$ is obviously connected. $\square$

Corollary 1.2. *Let I be a monomial ideal generated in degree d . Then I is linearly related if and only if for all $u, v \in G(I)$ there is a path in $G_I^{(u,v)}$ connecting u and v .*

Proof. Because of Proposition 1.1 it suffices to show that the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) $G_I^{(u,v)}$ is connected for all $u, v \in G(I)$;
 - (ii) for all $u, v \in G(I)$, there is a path in $G_I^{(u,v)}$ connecting u and v .
- (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) is obvious.
- (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): Let $w \in G_I^{(u,v)}$ with $w \neq u$. It is enough to show that w is connected to u by a path in $G_I^{(u,v)}$. By assumption w is connected to u by a path in $G_I^{(u,w)}$. Since $w \in G_I^{(u,v)}$ it follows that $\text{lcm}(u, w)$ divides $\text{lcm}(u, v)$. This implies that $G_I^{(u,w)}$ is an induced subgraph of $G_I^{(u,v)}$. Thus the path connecting w with u in $G_I^{(u,w)}$ also connects w and u in $G_I^{(u,v)}$. $\square$

2. POWERS OF EDGE IDEALS OF INDEX > 1

Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the set of all monomial ideals of S generated in degree two and $\mathcal{T}$ be the set of all graphs on the vertex set $[n]$ which do not have double edges but may have loops. There is an obvious bijection between $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{T}$. Indeed, if $I \in \mathcal{M}$ then the graph $G \in \mathcal{T}$ corresponding to I has the edge set $E(G) = \{\{i, j\} : x_i x_j \in G(I)\}$. In case $i = j$, the corresponding edge is a loop.

We say a graph G is gap free if for any two disjoint edges $e, e' \in E(G)$ there exists an edge $f \in E(G)$ such that $e \cap f \neq \emptyset \neq e' \cap f$. In the case that G is simple, G is gap free if and only if its complement $\bar{G}$ has no 4-cycle.

Theorem 2.1. *Let G be a finite graph (possibly with loops) and let I be its edge ideal. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) G is gap free.
- (b) $\text{index}(I^k) > 1$ for all $k \geq 1$.
- (c) $\text{index}(I^k) > 1$ for some $k \geq 1$.

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): By Corollary 1.2 it is enough to show that for all $k \geq 1$ and for all $u, v \in G(I^k)$ there is a path in $G_{I^k}^{(u,v)}$ connecting u and v . We may assume that $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) > 2k + 1$, since otherwise the assertion is trivial. We will prove this by induction on k . If $k = 1$, consider $G_I^{(u,v)}$ for $u, v \in G(I)$. Hence $u = x_i x_j$ and $v = x_{i'} x_{j'}$ with $\{i, j\}, \{i', j'\}$ edges in G . Since $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) > 3$ we have $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) = 4$. Our assumption implies that at least one of the edges $\{i, i'\}, \{i, j'\}, \{i', j\}, \{i', j'\}$ is in $E(G)$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\{i, i'\} \in E(G)$. Set $w = x_i x_{i'}$. So $w \in V(G_I^{(u,v)})$ and w connects u to v .

Now let $k > 1$, and suppose that $G_{I^{k-1}}^{(u,v)}$ is connected for all $u, v \in G(I^{k-1})$ with $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) > 2(k-1) + 1$.

Assume that $u/\tilde{w}, v/\tilde{w} \in G(I^{k-1})$ for some $\tilde{w} \in G(I)$. Since $\deg(\text{lcm}(u/\tilde{w}, v/\tilde{w})) > 2(k-1) + 1$, our induction hypothesis implies that there is a path $w_0, w_1, \dots, w_r$ in $G_{I^{k-1}}^{(u/\tilde{w}, v/\tilde{w})}$ with $w_0 = u/\tilde{w}$ and $w_r = v/\tilde{w}$. Since $\deg(\text{lcm}(w_i, w_{i+1})) = 2(k-1) + 1$

it follows that $\deg(\text{lcm}(\tilde{w}w_i, \tilde{w}w_{i+1})) = 2k + 1$ for all $0 \leq i \leq r - 1$, and since $\tilde{w}w_j \in V(G_{I^k}^{(u,v)})$ for all j , the sequence $u = \tilde{w}w_0, \tilde{w}w_1, \dots, \tilde{w}w_r = v$ is a path in $G_{I^k}^{(u,v)}$ connecting u and v .

We may now suppose that $u/\tilde{w}, v/\tilde{w} \notin G(I^{k-1})$ for all $\tilde{w} \in G(I)$. Since $u \neq v$ and $\deg u = \deg v$, there is an index i with $\deg_{x_i} v > \deg_{x_i} u$. In particular, there exists $\tilde{v} \in G(I)$ such that $v/\tilde{v} \in G(I^{k-1})$ and $\tilde{v} = x_i x_j$ for some j . In the further discussions we will distinguish four cases.

- (i) $\deg_{x_i} u \neq 0$ and $\deg_{x_j} u \neq 0$,
- (ii) $\deg_{x_i} u \neq 0$ and $\deg_{x_j} u = 0$,
- (iii) $\deg_{x_i} u = 0$ and $\deg_{x_j} u \neq 0$,
- (iv) $\deg_{x_i} u = 0$ and $\deg_{x_j} u = 0$.

We now first consider the cases (i), (ii) and (iii) and construct in these cases $w \in V(G_{I^k}^{(u,v)})$ such that following conditions hold:

- (α) $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, w)) = 2k + 1$;
- (β) $w/\tilde{v} \in G(I^{k-1})$.

Condition (α) implies that $\{u, w\} \in E(G_{I^k}^{(u,v)})$. In the case that $\deg(\text{lcm}(w, v)) \leq 2k + 1$, w is connected to v in $G_{I^k}^{(u,v)}$, and so u and v are connected in $G_{I^k}^{(u,v)}$. If $\deg(\text{lcm}(w, v)) > 2k + 1$, then condition (β) allows us to use induction on k as before, and to conclude that w is connected to v by a path in $G_{I^k}^{(u,v)}$, and hence u and v are connected in $G_{I^k}^{(u,v)}$. Thus (α) together with (β) implies that there is a path in $G_{I^k}^{(u,v)}$ connecting u and v .

There exists a factor $\tilde{u} \in G(I)$ of u such that $u/\tilde{u} \in G(I^{k-1})$ which in the cases (i) and (iii) is of the form $x_j x_{i_1}$ for some i_1 and in case (ii) is of the form $x_i x_{i_2}$ for some i_2 . It is seen that $\tilde{v} \neq \tilde{u}$, since otherwise $u/\tilde{v}, v/\tilde{v} \in G(I^{k-1})$, a contradiction. It follows that $i_1 \neq i$ and $i_2 \neq j$.

Let $w = (u/\tilde{u})\tilde{v}$. Then $w \in G(I^k)$.

In case (i), $\deg_{x_i} w = \deg_{x_i} u + 1$. Since $\deg_{x_i} v > \deg_{x_i} u$, it follows that $\deg_{x_i} w \leq \deg_{x_i} v$. We also note that $\deg_{x_j} w = \deg_{x_j} u$ and $\deg_{x_{i_1}} w = \deg_{x_{i_1}} u - 1 \leq \deg_{x_{i_1}} u$.

In case (ii), $\deg_{x_i} w = \deg_{x_i} u$. Moreover, $\deg_{x_j} w = \deg_{x_j} u + 1 = 1$ because x_j does not divide u . However, since x_j divides v , it follows that $\deg_{x_j} w \leq \deg_{x_j} v$. Finally $\deg_{x_{i_2}} w = \deg_{x_{i_2}} u - 1 \leq \deg_{x_{i_2}} u$.

In case (iii), $\deg_{x_i} w = \deg_{x_i} u + 1 = 1$ because x_i does not divide u . However, since x_i divides v , it follows that $\deg_{x_i} w \leq \deg_{x_i} v$. Moreover, $\deg_{x_j} w = \deg_{x_j} u$ and $\deg_{x_{i_1}} w = \deg_{x_{i_1}} u - 1 \leq \deg_{x_{i_1}} u$.

Thus in all the three cases $\deg_{x_t} w \leq \deg_{x_t}(\text{lcm}(u, v))$ for all variables x_t . Therefore w divides $\text{lcm}(u, v)$, and so by definition $w \in V(G_{I^k}^{(u,v)})$.

Note that $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, w)) = 2k + 1$, and $w/\tilde{v} = u/\tilde{u}$ which implies that $w/\tilde{v} \in G(I^{k-1})$. Therefore the assertion follows in these three cases.

Now we consider case (iv). Let $\tilde{u} \in G(I)$ with $u/\tilde{u} \in G(I^{k-1})$, and let $w = (u/\tilde{u})\tilde{v}$ with $\tilde{v}$ as above. Then $w \in G(I^k)$. Since neither x_i nor x_j divides u , we have

$\deg_{x_i} w = 1 = \deg_{x_j} w$. Thus $\deg_{x_t} w \leq \deg_{x_t}(\text{lcm}(u, v))$ for all variables x_t . It follows that w divides $\text{lcm}(u, v)$ and so $w \in V(G_{I^k}^{(u,v)})$.

Moreover, $w \neq v$. Indeed, suppose that $w = v$. Then $v/\tilde{v} = u/\tilde{u}$. Let $\tilde{w} \in G(I)$ with $(v/\tilde{v})/\tilde{w} \in G(I^{k-2})$. Then $v/\tilde{w}, u/\tilde{w} \in G(I^{k-1})$, a contradiction.

Furthermore, $w/\tilde{v}, v/\tilde{v} \in G(I^{k-1})$, and so if $\deg(\text{lcm}(w, v)) > 2k + 1$, by using the induction hypothesis there exists a path between $w/\tilde{v}$ and $v/\tilde{v}$ in $G_{I^{k-1}}^{(w/\tilde{v}, v/\tilde{v})}$. As above this implies that v and w are connected in $G_{I^k}^{(w,v)}$ and hence in $G_{I^k}^{(u,v)}$, since $G_{I^k}^{(w,v)}$ is a subgraph of $G_{I^k}^{(u,v)}$. In the case that $\deg(\text{lcm}(w, v)) \leq 2k + 1$, it is obvious that v and w are connected in $G_{I^k}^{(u,v)}$. Also by construction of w , we have $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, w)) > 2k + 1$, and the monomials u and w have a common factor, say $\tilde{w} \in G(I)$ such that $w/\tilde{w}, u/\tilde{w} \in G(I^{k-1})$. Again by using our induction hypothesis, we conclude that there exists a path between w and u in $G_{I^k}^{(u,v)}$. Therefore u and v are connected in $G_{I^k}^{(u,v)}$ also in this case.

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (c) is obvious.

(c) $\Rightarrow$ (a): Assume that G is not gap free. Thus there exist four different vertices i, i', j, j' such that $\{i, i'\}, \{j, j'\} \in E(G)$ while the edges $\{i, j\}, \{i, j'\}, \{i', j\}$ and $\{i', j'\}$ are not in $E(G)$. Let $k > 0$ be an arbitrary integer. We will show that $u = (x_i x_{i'})^k$ and $v = (x_j x_{j'})^k$ are not connected in $G_{I^k}^{(u,v)}$. Suppose that they are connected. Then there exists a monomial $w \in V(G_{I^k}^{(u,v)})$ such that $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, w)) = 2k + 1$. Clearly, $w \in V(G_{I^k}^{(u,v)})$ yields that $w \in G(I^k)$ with the property that w divides $\text{lcm}(u, v)$. Moreover, $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, w)) = 2k + 1$ implies that either $x_i^k x_{i'}^{k-1}$ or $x_i^{k-1} x_{i'}^k$ divides w .

Note that $\text{lcm}(u, v) = x_i^k x_{i'}^k x_j^k x_{j'}^k$, and since w divides $\text{lcm}(u, v)$, either x_j or $x_{j'}$ divides w . This means that one of $\{i, j\}, \{i, j'\}, \{i', j\}$ or $\{i', j'\}$ must be an edge of G which is a contradiction. Therefore, u and v are not connected in $G_{I^k}^{(u,v)}$. Corollary 1.2 implies that I^k does not have linear relations, a contradiction. $\square$

Examples 2.2. (a) Let G be a tree on the vertex set $[n]$ and I its edge ideal. Then either $\text{index}(I^k) = 1$ or $\text{index}(I^k) = \infty$ for any $k > 0$. Indeed, suppose that $\text{index}(I) = t < \infty$. If $n \leq 4$, Fröberg's theorem [F, Theorem 1] implies that $\text{index}(I) = \infty$. Therefore, $n > 4$. By [EGHP, Theorem 2.1] there exists a minimal cycle C of length $t + 3$ in $\bar{G}$. Suppose that $V(C) = \{1, 2, \dots, t + 3\}$ and $E(C) = \{\{i, i + 1\} : 1 \leq i \leq t + 2\} \cup \{\{1, t + 3\}\}$. If $t > 1$, then $|V(C)| \geq 5$ and since C is minimal we have $\{1, 3\}, \{1, 4\}, \{2, 4\}, \{2, 5\}, \{3, 5\} \notin E(\bar{G})$. Therefore there exists a cycle in G , a contradiction.

By using [HHZ2, Theorem 3.2] if $\text{index}(I) = \infty$, then $\text{index}(I^k) = \infty$ for any $k > 0$. Moreover, by using Theorem 2.1, if $\text{index}(I) = 1$, then $\text{index}(I^k) = 1$ for any $k > 0$.

(b) Let G be a simple graph on the vertex set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$. We define the *whisker graph* $W(G)$ of G by adding to the vertex set of G the new vertices $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$. The edge set of $W(G)$ is $E(G) \cup \{\{x_i, y_i\} : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. Furthermore by $L(G)$ we

denote a graph obtained from G by adding a loop to each of its vertices and call it the *loop graph* of G .

Again as a consequence of Theorem 2.1, it follows together with [HHZ2, Theorem 3.2] that $I(L(G))^k$ has a linear resolution for all k if and only if G is complete, and $\text{index}(I(L(G))^k) = 1$ for all k if and only if G is not complete. A similar statement holds for $I(W(G))$, because $I(W(G))$ is obtained from $I(L(G))$ by polarization.

3. EDGE IDEALS OF MAXIMAL FINITE INDEX

A monomial ideal I of finite index has $\text{index}(I) \leq \text{proj dim}(I)$. We say that I has *maximal finite index* if equality holds. In this section we classify those graphs whose edge ideal has maximal finite index. In particular our aim is to prove the following result.

Theorem 3.1. *Let G be a simple graph on the vertex set $[n]$ with no isolated vertices, and let I be its edge ideal. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) *The complement $\bar{G}$ of G is a cycle of length n .*
- (b) $\text{index}(I) = \text{proj dim}(I)$.

If the equivalent conditions hold, then $\text{proj dim}(I) = n - 3$.

To prove this theorem we need some intermediate steps. We first observe the following fact which will be used several times in the sequel:

Let G be a graph on the vertex set $[n]$ and $\Delta(G)$ be its clique complex. For any $W \subseteq [n]$ we have

$$\Delta(G_W) = \Delta(G)_W.$$

In other words, $\Delta(G)_W$ is the clique complex of induced subgraph of G on the vertex set W . Moreover, G_W is connected if and only if Δ_W is connected. Here G_W (resp. $\Delta(G)_W$) denotes the induced subgraph of G (resp. the induced subcomplex of $\Delta(G)$) whose vertex set is W .

Lemma 3.2. *Let G be a simple graph on the vertex set $[n]$ and I its edge ideal. Suppose that $\text{index}(I) = \text{proj dim}(I) = t$. Then $\beta_{t,t+2}(I) = 0$*

Proof. By using Hochster's formula [HH, Theorem 8.1.1], it is enough to show that $\tilde{H}_0(\Delta_W; K) = 0$ for any $W \subset [n]$ with $|W| = t + 2$. To show this, it is sufficient to prove that Δ_W (equivalently $(\bar{G})_W$) is connected for any $W \subset [n]$ with $|W| = t + 2$.

Since $\text{index}(I) = t$, [EGHP, Theorem 2.1] implies that there exists a minimal cycle C of length $t + 3$ in $\bar{G}$. Without loss of generality we may suppose that $V(C) = \{1, 2, \dots, t + 3\}$ and $E(C) = \{\{i, i + 1\} : 1 \leq i \leq t + 2\} \cup \{\{1, t + 3\}\}$.

Let W be a subset of $[n]$ with $|W| = t + 2$. We consider different cases for W and prove in each case that $(\bar{G})_W$ is connected.

First assume that $W \subset V(C)$. Since $V(C)$ has just one vertex more than W we see that $(\bar{G})_W$ is a line graph and thus is connected.

It remains to consider the case $W \setminus V(C) \neq \emptyset$.

We first claim that for all $j \in W \setminus V(C)$ and all $i \in V(C)$ we have $\{j, i\} \in E(\bar{G})$.

Indeed, suppose that $\{j, i\} \notin E(\bar{G})$ for some $j \in W \setminus V(C)$ and some $i \in V(C)$. Let $W' = V(C) \cup \{j\}$ and consider $\Delta_{W'}$. Note that $\Delta_{W'}$, as a topological space, is homotopy equivalent either to $\mathcal{S}_1$ or to $\mathcal{S}_1$ together with an isolated point. The second case happens only if $\{j, i\} \notin E(\bar{G})$ for all $i \in V(C)$. In either case we see that $\tilde{H}_1(\Delta_{W'}; K) \neq 0$. Now Hochster's formula implies that $\beta_{t+1, t+4}(I) \neq 0$, and so $\text{proj dim}(I) \geq t+1$, a contradiction. Thus the claim follows.

Now Hochster's formula implies that $\beta_{t+1, t+4}(I) \neq 0$, and so $\text{proj dim}(I) \geq t+1$, a contradiction. Thus the claim follows.

Our claim implies that $(\bar{G})_W$ is connected, if $W \cap V(C) \neq \emptyset$.

Now suppose that $W \cap V(C) = \emptyset$. Then $|W \setminus V(C)| = |W| = t+2 \geq 3$. Suppose that there exist $j, j' \in W$ such that $\{j, j'\} \notin E(\bar{G})$. Let $W'' = V(C) \cup \{j, j'\}$. Since C is a minimal cycle and since j, j' are neighbors of all vertices of C we have $\mathcal{F}(\Delta_{W''}) = \{\{i, i+1, j\}, \{i, i+1, j'\} : 1 \leq i \leq t+2\} \cup \{\{1, t+3, j\}, \{1, t+3, j'\}\}$. It follows that $\Delta_{W''}$, as a topological space, is homotopy equivalent to $\mathcal{S}_2$. Therefore $\tilde{H}_2(\Delta_{W''}; K) \neq 0$ and so $\beta_{t+1, t+5} \neq 0$, by Hochster's formula. This implies that $\text{proj dim}(I) \geq t+1$, a contradiction. So in this case $\{j, j'\} \in E(\bar{G})$ for all $j, j' \in W$. It follows that $(\bar{G})_W$ is a complete graph and so is connected. This completes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 3.3. *Let G be a simple graph on the vertex set $[n]$ with no isolated vertices, and let I be its edge ideal. Suppose that $\text{index}(I) = \text{proj dim}(I) = t$. Then*

- (a) $n = t+3$,
- (b) $\beta_{t, t+3}(I) = 1$.

Proof. (a) Let $\Delta = \Delta(\bar{G})$. By Lemma 3.2, $\beta_{t, t+2}(I) = 0$, and so as a consequence of Hochster's formula, Δ_W is connected for any $W \subset [n]$ with $|W| = t+2$. Since $\text{index}(I) = t$, [EGHP, Theorem 2.1] implies that there exists a minimal cycle of length $t+3$ in $\bar{G}$, say C . We may assume that $V(C) = \{1, 2, \dots, t+3\}$ and $E(C) = \{\{i, i+1\} : 1 \leq i \leq t+2\} \cup \{\{1, t+3\}\}$.

Assume that $n > t+3$. We will show that under this assumption, there exists $W \subset [n]$ such that either $|W| = t+2$ and $(\bar{G})_W$ is disconnected which implies that Δ_W is disconnected, or $|W| = t+5$ and $\tilde{H}_2(\Delta_W; K) \neq 0$ which implies that $\beta_{t+1, t+5}(I) \neq 0$, and so in that case $\text{proj dim}(I) > t$. Both cases are not possible, and hence it will follow that $n = t+3$.

For the construction of such W we consider two cases. Let $j \in [n] \setminus [t+3]$.

Suppose first that there exists $1 \leq i \leq t+3$ such that $\{j, i\} \notin E(\bar{G})$. Let $W = \{j\} \cup V(C) \setminus \{r, s\}$ where r and s are neighbors of i in C . So $|W| = t+2$ and $(\bar{G})_W$ is not connected.

Suppose now that $\{j, i\} \in E(\bar{G})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t+3$. Assume that either $[n] \setminus V(C) = \{j\}$ or for all $j' \in [n] \setminus V(C)$ we have $\{j, j'\} \in E(\bar{G})$. Then j is an isolated vertex of G , a contradiction, since by assumption G has no isolated vertices. So there exists $j' \in [n] \setminus V(C)$ such that $\{j, j'\} \notin E(\bar{G})$.

We may assume that $\{j', i\} \in E(\bar{G})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t+3$, because otherwise, as we have seen before for j , there exists $W \subset [n]$ with $|W| = t+2$ such that $(\bar{G})_W$

is not connected. Now let $W = V(C) \cup \{j, j'\}$. As we mentioned in the proof of Lemma 3.2, $\tilde{H}_2(\Delta_W; K) \neq 0$ and so $\beta_{t+1, t+5} \neq 0$.

(b) Since $\text{index}(I) = t$, [EGHP, Theorem 2.1] implies that there exists a minimal cycle of length $t + 3$ in $\bar{G}$, say C . Let $\Delta = \Delta(\bar{G})$. Then $\tilde{H}_1(\Delta_{V(C)}; K) \neq 0$. Hochster's formula implies that $\beta_{t, t+3}(I) \geq 1$. Since $n = t + 3$, the only $W \subseteq [n]$ with $|W| = t + 3$ is $V(C)$, and so $\beta_{t, t+3}(I) = 1$, again by Hochster's formula. $\square$

Now we are ready to prove the main theorem of this section.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. The implication (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) and also $\text{proj dim}(I) = n - 3$ follows from [EGHP, Example 2.2].

(b) $\Rightarrow$ (a): Let $\text{index}(I) = t$. By [EGHP, Theorem 2.1], $\bar{G}$ contains a minimal cycle of length $t + 3$. Proposition 3.3 implies that G has $t + 3$ vertices and so does $\bar{G}$. Hence in $\bar{G}$ there are no other vertices. Therefore $\bar{G}$ is a minimal cycle of length $t + 3$. Moreover, $\text{proj dim}(I) = n - 3$. $\square$

The following result supports our conjecture that for a monomial ideal I generated in degree 2 one has $\text{index}(I^{k+1}) > \text{index}(I^k)$ if $\text{index}(I) > 1$.

Corollary 3.4. *Let I be the edge ideal of a simple graph G and suppose that I has maximal finite index > 1 . Then $\text{index}(I^k) = \infty$ for all $k \geq 2$.*

Proof. We may assume that G has no isolated vertices. By Theorem 3.1 we know that G is the complement of an n -cycle with $n \geq 5$, in particular G is gap free. We claim that G is claw free. Then by a theorem of Banerjee [B, Theorem 6.17], the assertion follows. In order to prove the claim, let $\{i, i + 1\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$ and $\{1, n\}$ be the edges of the cycle $\bar{G}$. Suppose G admits a claw. Then by symmetry we may assume that $\{1, i\}$, $\{1, j\}$ and $\{1, k\}$ with $1 < i < j < k$ are the edges of the claw. However, $\{i, k\} \in \bar{G}$, a contradiction. $\square$

4. SQUAREFREE POWERS

Let $I \subset S$ be a squarefree monomial ideal. Then the k -th squarefree power of I , denoted by $I^{[k]}$, is the monomial ideal generated by all squarefree monomials in $G(I^k)$.

Let J be an arbitrary monomial ideal and let $\alpha = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ be an integer vector with $a_i \geq 0$. Then we let $J_{\leq \alpha}$ be the monomial ideal generated by all monomials $x_1^{c_1} \cdots x_n^{c_n} \in G(J)$ with $c_i \leq a_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Now let $\alpha = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$. Then $(I^k)_{\leq \alpha} = I^{[k]}$. Therefore it follows from [HHZ1, Lemma 4.4] that $\beta_{i,j}(I^{[k]}) \leq \beta_{i,j}(I^k)$ for all k . This together with Theorem 2.1 implies:

- (i) $\text{index}(I^{[k]}) \geq \text{index}(I^k)$ for all k ;
- (ii) if G is gap free and $I = I(G)$, then $\text{index}(I^{[k]}) > 1$ for all k .

Here we use the convention that the index of the zero ideal is infinity.

The inequality (i) may be strict or not. Indeed, if I is the monomial ideal given by Nevo and Peeva in [NP, Counterexample 1.10], then it can be shown by computer that $\text{index}(I^k) = \text{index}(I^{[k]})$ for $k = 1, \dots, 4$. On the other hand, if G is a 9-cycle,

then $\text{index}(I) = 1$, $\text{index}(I^{[2]}) = 1$, $\text{index}(I^{[3]}) = 2$ and $\text{index}(I^{[k]}) = \infty$ for $k > 3$, while by Theorem 2.1, $\text{index}(I^k) = 1$ for all k .


The converse of (ii) is not true, that is, G may not be gap free but $\text{index}(I^{[k]}) > 1$ for some k . Of course, $\text{index}(I^{[k]}) > 1$ for $k > n/2$, since for such powers $I^{[k]} = 0$. But even if $I^{[k]} \neq 0$ and G is not gap free we may have $\text{index}(I^{[k]}) > 1$. For example, if G is the graph with vertex set $[4]$ and edges $\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}$. Then G is not gap free, but $\text{index}(I(G)^{[2]}) = \infty$, because in this case $I(G)^{[2]} = (x_1x_2x_3x_4)$. This and many other examples lead us the Conjecture 4.3 below.

In the following we assume G admits no isolated vertices. Recall that a set of edges of G without common vertices is called a *matching* of G . The *matching number* of G , denoted $\nu(G)$, is the maximal size of a matching of G . Let I be the edge ideal of G . Note that the generators of $I^{[k]}$ correspond bijectively to the set of matchings of G of size k .


A matching with the property that one edge in this matching forms a gap with any other edge of this matching will be called a *restricted matching*. We denote by $\nu_0(G)$ the maximal size of a restricted matching of G . If there is no restricted matching we set $\nu_0(G) = 1$. Obviously we have

$$\nu_0(G) \leq \nu(G) = \max\{k: I^{[k]} \neq 0\}.$$

For example if G is the whisker graph of a 5-cycle, then $\nu(G) = 5$ and $\nu_0(G) = 3$.



A matching of maximal size



A matching of maximal size with gaps

In general $\nu(G) - \nu_0(G)$ can be arbitrarily large. For example, let K_n be the complete graph on n vertices. Then for its whisker graph $W(K_n)$ we have $\nu(W(K_n)) = n$ and $\nu_0(W(K_n)) = 1$.

On the other hand, let G be an arbitrary tree. We claim that $\nu_0(G) \geq \nu(G) - 1$. To see this, let G be an arbitrary graph. We introduce for each matching M of G a graph $\Gamma_M(G)$ which we call the *matching graph* of G . The vertices of $\Gamma_M(G)$ are the elements of M . Let e_1, e_2 be two elements of M (which are edges of G). Then $\{e_1, e_2\}$ is an edge of $\Gamma_M(G)$ if and only if there is another edge e in G such that $e \cap e_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $e \cap e_2 \neq \emptyset$.

Observe that if G is a tree, then $\Gamma_M(G)$ is a tree. Indeed, suppose that G is a tree and M a matching of G . Assume that $\Gamma_M(G)$ contains a cycle C which we may assume to be minimal. Without loss of generality we may furthermore assume that $V(C) = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_t\}$ and $E(C) = \{\{e_i, e_{i+1}\}: 1 \leq i \leq t-1\} \cup \{\{e_1, e_t\}\}$. Therefore there exist $e'_1, e'_2, \dots, e'_t \in E(G)$ such that $e'_i \cap e_i \neq \emptyset \neq e'_i \cap e_{i+1}$ for all

$1 \leq i \leq t-1$ and $e'_i \cap e_t \neq \emptyset \neq e'_i \cap e_1$. Assume that $e'_i \cap e_i = \{v_i\}$, $e'_i \cap e_{i+1} = \{w_i\}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t-1$, and $e'_t \cap e_t = \{v_t\}$ and $e'_t \cap e_1 = \{w_t\}$. Since $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_t\}$ is a matching, it follows that for all i and j with $i \neq j$ the edges e_i and e_j do not have common vertex. Thus $\{v_i\} = e'_i \cap e_i \neq e'_j \cap e_j = \{v_j\}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t-1$, and $\{v_t\} = e'_t \cap e_t \neq e'_1 \cap e_1 = \{v_1\}$. Similarly $w_i \neq w_j$ for all i, j with $i \neq j$. Suppose that $v_i = w_j$ for some i, j . Then $e_i \cap e_{j+1} \neq \emptyset$. This is only possible if $j = i-1$. Therefore $v_i \neq w_j$ for all i, j with $i-j > 1$. Now consider the sequence of vertices $v_1, w_1, v_2, w_2, \dots, v_t, w_t$ in $V(G)$. Clearly v_i is connected to w_i in G by e'_i . Moreover w_i is connected to v_{i+1} in G by e_{i+1} , and also w_t is connected to v_1 by e_1 . If $w_i = v_{i+1}$, then w_i is connected to w_{i+1} by e'_{i+1} . By removing all v_{i+1} from the above sequence whenever $w_i = v_{i+1}$, we obtain a cycle in G , a contradiction.

Now suppose that G is a tree and M is a maximal matching of G . So $|M| = \nu(G)$. If $\Gamma_M(G)$ contains an isolated vertex e , then M is a restricted matching and hence in this case $\nu_0(G) = \nu(G)$. Suppose that there exists no maximal matching M with the property that $\Gamma_M(G)$ admits an isolated vertex. Since $\Gamma_M(G)$ is a tree, as we have seen before, there exists a vertex e in $\Gamma_M(G)$ of degree one. Suppose that $\{e, e'\} \in E(\Gamma_M(G))$. Then e is an isolated vertex in the induced subgraph of $\Gamma_M(G)$ on the vertex set $V(\Gamma_M(G)) \setminus \{e'\}$. Hence $M \setminus \{e'\}$ is a maximal restricted matching of G , and so $\nu_0(G) = \nu(G) - 1$.

In contrast to the ordinary powers of edge ideals there exists for any edge ideal I a nonzero squarefree power of I with linear resolution, as follows from the next result.

Theorem 4.1. *Let G be a simple graph on the vertex set $[n]$ and I its edge ideal. Then $I^{[\nu(G)]}$ has linear quotients.*

Proof. Let $u_1 > u_2 > \dots > u_t$ be the generators of $I^{[\nu(G)]}$ ordered lexicographically and let $u_j = u_1^{(j)} u_2^{(j)} \dots u_\nu^{(j)}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq t$ where $u_k^{(j)} \in G(I)$ is a monomial corresponding to an edge of G . We will show that for all $2 \leq i \leq t$, the colon ideal $(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{i-1}) : u_i$ is generated by linear forms. Set $J_i = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{i-1})$. Note that $\{u_k / \gcd(u_k, u_i) : 1 \leq k \leq i-1\}$ is a set of generators of $J_i : u_i$, see for example [HH, Proposition 1.2.2]. Suppose l is an integer such that $u_l / \gcd(u_l, u_i)$ is not a variable, and assume that $x_r x_s$ divides $u_l / \gcd(u_l, u_i)$. Suppose $\{r, s\} \in E(G)$. Then $\{r, s\}$ together with the edges corresponding to the factors $u_k^{(i)}$ of u_i is a matching of G of size $\nu + 1$, a contradiction. Hence no distinct pair of variables which divide $u_l / \gcd(u_l, u_i)$ corresponds to an edge of G .

By induction on the degree of $u_l / \gcd(u_l, u_i)$ we prove that $u_l / \gcd(u_l, u_i)$ does not belong to the minimal generating set of $J_i : u_i$, if $\deg(u_l / \gcd(u_l, u_i)) > 1$. Indeed we will show that there exists a monomial $u_{l'}$ with $1 \leq l' \leq i-1$ such that $u_{l'} / \gcd(u_{l'}, u_i)$ is of degree one and divides $u_l / \gcd(u_l, u_i)$.

Assume that $\deg(u_l / \gcd(u_l, u_i)) = 2$. Let $u_l / \gcd(u_l, u_i) = x_r x_s$. Since x_r and x_s divide u_l there exist $1 \leq k, k' \leq \nu$ and $1 \leq r', s' \leq n$ such that $u_k^{(l)} = x_r x_{r'}$ and $u_{k'}^{(l)} = x_s x_{s'}$. Since $\{r, r'\}, \{s, s'\} \in E(G)$, the above argument shows that $x_r x_{r'}$ and $x_s x_{s'}$ do not divide $u_l / \gcd(u_l, u_i)$. Therefore, since x_r and x_s divide $u_l / \gcd(u_l, u_i)$

we conclude that $x_{r'}, x_{s'}$ divide u_i . Thus there exist $1 \leq f, f' \leq \nu$ and $1 \leq r'', s'' \leq n$ such that $u_f^{(i)} = x_{r'} x_{r''}$ and $u_{f'}^{(i)} = x_{s'} x_{s''}$.

Suppose that $r < r''$. Let $u = (u_i/u_f^{(i)})u_k^{(l)}$. Obviously $u \in G(I^{[\nu]})$ and since $r < r''$ and $u = (u_i/x_{r'})x_{r''}$, we have $u > u_i$. Therefore there exists $l' < i$ such that $u_{l'} = u$. This implies that $u_{l'} \in G(J_i)$. Moreover, $u_{l'}/\gcd(u_{l'}, u_i) = x_r$ and x_r divides $u_l/\gcd(u_l, u_i)$.

Now suppose that $r > r''$. Let $u = (u_l/u_k^{(l)})u_f^{(i)}$. So $u \in G(I^{[\nu]})$ and since $r > r''$ and $u = (u_l/x_r)x_{r''}$ we have $u > u_l$. Therefore there exists l' with $l' < i$ such that $u_{l'} = u$. This implies that $u_{l'} \in G(J_i)$. Moreover, $u_{l'}/\gcd(u_{l'}, u_i) = x_s$ and x_s divides $u_l/\gcd(u_l, u_i)$.

Thus in both cases $u_l/\gcd(u_l, u_i)$ is divided by a degree one generator of $J_i: u_i$.

Suppose now that $m > 2$ and for any $j < i$ with $1 < \deg(u_j/\gcd(u_j, u_i)) < m$ the monomial $u_j/\gcd(u_j, u_i)$ is divided by a degree one generator of $J_i: u_i$. Assume that $\deg(u_l/\gcd(u_l, u_i)) = m$. Let $x_r x_s$ divide $u_l/\gcd(u_l, u_i)$. The same argument as above implies that there exists a monomial u_j with $1 \leq j \leq i-1$ such that $\deg(u_j/\gcd(u_j, u_i)) = m-1$ and $u_j/\gcd(u_j, u_i)$ divides $u_l/\gcd(u_l, u_i)$. By induction hypothesis here exists a monomial $u_{l'}$ with $1 \leq l' \leq i-1$ such that $u_{l'}/\gcd(u_{l'}, u_i)$ is of degree one and divides $u_j/\gcd(u_j, u_i)$. It follows that $u_{l'}/\gcd(u_{l'}, u_i)$ divides $u_l/\gcd(u_l, u_i)$. Therefore $u_l/\gcd(u_l, u_i)$ does not belong to the minimal generating set of $J_i: u_i$. So the assertion follows. $\square$

Let I be an edge ideal of a simple graph G . Because of Theorem 4.1, $\text{index}(I^{[\nu(G)]}) > 1$. The question arises which is the smallest integer k_0 such that $\text{index}(I^{[k]}) > 1$ for all $k \geq k_0$. A partial answer to this question is given by the next lemma which implies that $k_0 \geq \nu_0(G)$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let G be a simple graph and I its edge ideal. Then $\text{index}(I^{[k]}) = 1$ if $0 < k < \nu_0(G)$.*

Proof. Let $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{\nu_0(G)}\}$ be a restricted matching of G such that the pairs e_1, e_i form a gap of G for $i = 2, \dots, \nu_0(G)$, and let $u_1, \dots, u_{\nu_0(G)} \in G(I)$ be the corresponding monomials. Let $0 < k < \nu_0(G)$, and $u = u_1 u_2 \cdots u_k$ and $v = u_2 u_3 \cdots u_{k+1}$. We claim that u and v are disconnected in $G_{I^{[k]}}^{(u,v)}$ which then by Corollary 1.2 yields the desired conclusion.

Let $w \in G_{I^{[k]}}^{(u,v)}$ and suppose that $u_1 = x_r x_s$. Since $\text{lcm}(u, v) = u_1 u_2 \cdots u_{k+1}$, the condition on the edges e_i implies that if x_r or x_s divides w then u_1 divides w . Thus either $w = v$ or u_1 divides w . Assume now that u and v are connected in $G_{I^{[k]}}^{(u,v)}$. Then there exists $w \in G_{I^{[k]}}^{(u,v)}$ with $w \neq v$ and such that $\text{lcm}(w, v) = 2k+1$. However, $\text{lcm}(w, v) = 2k+2$ since u_1 divides w , a contradiction. $\square$

We actually expect that $k_0 = \nu_0(G)$. Thus we have the following

Conjecture 4.3. *Let G be a simple graph and I its edge ideal. Then $\text{index}(I^{[k]}) > 1$ if and only if $k \geq \nu_0(G)$.*

In support of our conjecture we prove the following result.

Theorem 4.4. *Let C_n be a cycle of length $n > 3$ and I its edge ideal. Then the conjecture holds for C_n . More precisely we have*

- (a) $\nu(C_n) = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$;
- (b) $\nu_0(C_n) = \nu(C_n) - 1$;
- (c) *If n is even, then the ideal $I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}$ has linear quotients. If n is odd, then $\text{index}(I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}) = 2$.*

To prove this theorem we need some preliminary steps.

Lemma 4.5. *Let C_n be a cycle of length $n > 3$ and I its edge ideal.*

- (a) *If n is even, then*

$$G(I^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} - 1 \rfloor}) = \left\{ \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i}{x_r x_s} : r < s, s - r \text{ odd} \right\}.$$

- (b) *If n is odd, then*

$$G(I^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} - 1 \rfloor}) = \left\{ \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i}{x_r x_s x_t} : r < s < t, s - r \text{ and } t - s \text{ odd} \right\}.$$

Proof. (a) Since the generators of $G(I^{\lfloor n/2 - 1 \rfloor})$ correspond to matchings of C_n of size $n/2 - 1$ and since any such matching misses exactly two vertices, say r and s with $r < s$, it follows that each component of $C_n \setminus \{r, s\}$ has an even number of vertices. One of the components is $[r + 1, s - 1]$. Therefore $s - r$ is an odd number.

(b) Since the generators of $G(I^{\lfloor (n-1)/2 - 1 \rfloor})$ correspond to matchings of C_n of size $(n-1)/2 - 1$ and since any such matching misses exactly three vertices, say r , s and t with $r < s < t$, it follows that each component of $C_n \setminus \{r, s, t\}$ has an even number of vertices. Two of the components are $[r + 1, s - 1]$ and $[s + 1, t - 1]$. Therefore $s - r$ and $t - s$ are odd numbers. $\square$

Lemma 4.6. *Let C_n be a cycle of odd length $n > 3$ and I its edge ideal. Then*

$$I^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} - 1 \rfloor} = I_\Delta,$$

where Δ is the simplicial complex with facet set

$$\{[n] \setminus \{r, s, t\} : r < s < t, s - r \text{ or } t - s \text{ even}\}.$$

Proof. For $F \subseteq [n]$ we set $\mathbf{x}_F = \prod_{i \in F} x_i$. Let Δ be a simplicial complex with the set of minimal nonfaces

$$\mathcal{N}(\Delta) = \{F : \mathbf{x}_F \in G(I^{\lfloor (n-3)/2 \rfloor})\}.$$

Then $I_\Delta = I^{\lfloor (n-3)/2 \rfloor}$, and hence $F \subset [n]$ with $|F| = n - 3$ belongs to Δ if and only if $\mathbf{x}_F \notin G(I^{\lfloor (n-3)/2 \rfloor})$. By Lemma 4.5 this is the case if and only if $F = [n] \setminus \{r, s, t\}$ for some r, s, t with $r < s < t$ and such that $s - r$ or $t - s$ is even.

Next we claim that all sets $H \subset [n]$ with $|H| \geq n - 2$ are non-faces of Δ . For that it suffices to show that each $H \subset [n]$ with $|H| = n - 2$ is a non-face of Δ , i.e. $\mathbf{x}_H \in (I^{\lfloor (n-3)/2 \rfloor})$. Let $H = [n] \setminus \{r, s\}$ with $r < s$. Then $\mathbf{x}_H \in (I^{\lfloor (n-3)/2 \rfloor})$ if and only if there exists a matching of C_n of size $(n-3)/2$ whose vertex set does not contain r, s .

Removing the vertices r and s from C_n we obtain two line graphs L_1 and L_2 with $|V(L_1)| = k_1$ and $|V(L_2)| = k_2$ and such that $k_1 + k_2 = n - 2$, possibly with one of k_1, k_2 equal to zero. Thus a matching of C_n which avoids the vertices r and s is the same as a matching of L_1 and L_2 . It follows that such a maximal size matching has size $\lfloor k_1/2 \rfloor + \lfloor k_2/2 \rfloor$. Since n is odd and $k_1 + k_2 = n - 2$, we conclude that one of k_1, k_2 is odd and the other one is even. So that in any case $\lfloor k_1/2 \rfloor + \lfloor k_2/2 \rfloor = (n - 3)/2$, as desired.

It remains to be shown that there are no facets $F \in \Delta$ with $|F| \leq n - 4$. This fact will follow once we have shown that for any subset $M \subset [n]$ with $|M| = 4$ there exists $N = \{r, s, t\} \subset M$ with $r < s < t$ and such that $s - r$ or $t - s$ is even. But this immediately follows from the next lemma. $\square$

In order to simplify our discussion we introduce the set

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\{r, s, t\} : r < s < t, s - r \text{ or } t - s \text{ even}\}.$$

For this set there are 6 different patterns possible as indicated in the following list:

$$(i) \ eee, \quad (ii) \ eeo, \quad (iii) \ oee, \quad (iv) \ ooo, \quad (v) \ ooe, \quad (vi) \ eoo.$$

Here e stands for even and o for odd. For example, (iii) describes the case where r is odd, s is even and t is even.

The following observation will be useful in the proof of Proposition 4.8.

Lemma 4.7. *For any $M = \{t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4\}$ with $1 \leq t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < t_4 \leq n$. We set $M_i = M \setminus \{t_i\}$. Let*

$$\mathcal{S}(M) = \{i : M_i \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{S}(M)$ has 2 or 4 elements. More precisely, if $|\mathcal{S}(M)| = 2$, then either $\mathcal{S}(M) = \{i, i + 1\}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 3$ or $\mathcal{S}(M) = \{1, 4\}$.

Proof. The set $\mathcal{S}(M)$ consists of 4 elements, if the even-odd pattern on M is one of the following $eeee, eeeo, oeee, eeoo, ooe, eooo, oooo, oooo$.

Otherwise we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(eoe) &= \{1, 2\}, \quad \mathcal{S}(eeoe) = \{3, 4\}, \quad \mathcal{S}(oeoe) = \{2, 3\}, \quad \mathcal{S}(oeeo) = \{1, 4\}, \\ \mathcal{S(eoeo)} &= \{2, 3\}, \quad \mathcal{S(eooo)} = \{1, 4\}, \quad \mathcal{S(oeoo)} = \{1, 2\}, \quad \mathcal{S(ooeo)} = \{3, 4\}. \end{aligned}$$

The assertion of the lemma follows from this list. $\square$

Proposition 4.8. *Let C_n be a cycle of odd length $n > 3$ and I its edge ideal. Then*

$$\beta_{2,n}(I^{\lfloor \frac{n-3}{2} \rfloor}) \neq 0.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.6, $I^{\lfloor \frac{n-3}{2} \rfloor} = I_\Delta$ with

$$\mathcal{F}(\Delta) = \{[n] \setminus \{r, s, t\} : \{r, s, t\} \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$

So, by using Hochster's formula, it is enough to show that $\tilde{H}_{n-4}(\Delta; K) \neq 0$.

Let ∂_j be j -th chain map in augmented oriented chain complex $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta)$ of Δ . The elements $b_F = [i_0, i_1, \dots, i_j]$ with $F = \{i_0, i_1, \dots, i_j\} \in \Delta$ and $i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_j$ form a K -basis of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_j$. By $(b_F)_t$ we denote the basis element $[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{t-1}, i_{t+1}, \dots, i_j]$.

We have $\tilde{H}_{n-4}(\Delta; K) = \text{Ker } \partial_{n-4} / \text{Im } \partial_{n-3}$. Since $\dim \Delta = n-4$, this implies that $\text{Im } \partial_{n-3} = 0$. Set $\sigma(F) = \sum_{t=0}^j i_t$. We let

$$\tau = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta)} (-1)^{\sigma(F)} b_F,$$

and claim that $\tau \in \text{Ker } \partial_{n-4}$. The claim will imply that

$$\tilde{H}_{n-4}(\Delta; K) = \text{Ker } \partial_{n-4} \neq 0.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} (2) \quad \partial_{n-4}(\tau) &= \sum_{b_F \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{n-4}} (-1)^{\sigma(F)} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-4} (-1)^j (b_F)_j \right) \\ &= \sum_{b_G \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{n-5}} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-4} \sum_{\substack{b_F \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{n-4} \\ (b_F)_j = b_G}} (-1)^{\sigma(F)+j} \right) b_G. \end{aligned}$$

We will show that for any $b_G \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{n-5}$, the coefficient

$$\alpha_G = \sum_{j=0}^{n-4} \sum_{\substack{b_F \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{n-4} \\ (b_F)_j = b_G}} (-1)^{\sigma(F)+j}$$

of b_G in (2) is zero. This then will imply that $\partial_{n-4}(\tau) = 0$, as desired.

Let $G = [n] \setminus M$ where $M = \{t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4\}$ with $t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < t_4$. We set $G^{(i)} = G \cup \{t_i\}$. Let n_i be the position of t_i in $b_{G^{(i)}}$. Thus $(b_{G^{(i)}})_{n_i} = b_G$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 4$. In order to determine the integers i , $1 \leq i \leq 4$, with $G^{(i)} \in \Delta$, it is enough to consider $\mathcal{S}(M)$. By Lemma 4.7, $\mathcal{S}(M)$ is either $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ or $\{i, i+1\}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 3$ or $\{1, 4\}$.

In the following we compute α_G depending on the set $\mathcal{S}(M)$.

Suppose first that $\mathcal{S}(M) = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Then $\alpha_G = \sum_{i=1}^4 (-1)^{\sigma(G^{(i)})+n_i} = 0$, because $(-1)^{\sigma(G^{(i)})+n_i} = -(-1)^{\sigma(G^{(i+1)})+n_{i+1}}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 3$.

Indeed, since all the integers between t_i and t_{i+1} belong to $G^{(i)}$ as well as to $G^{(i+1)}$, it follows that $n_{i+1} = n_i + r$ where $r = t_{i+1} - t_i - 1$. Assume first that t_i and t_{i+1} both are even or both are odd. Then r is odd and

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{\sigma(G^{(i)})+n_i} &= (-1)^{(\sigma(G)+t_i)+n_i} \\ &= (-1)^{\sigma(G)+n_i} (-1)^{t_i} \\ &= (-1)^{\sigma(G)+(n_{i+1}-r)} (-1)^{t_{i+1}} \\ &= (-1)^{(\sigma(G)+t_{i+1})+(n_{i+1}-r)} \\ &= (-1)^{\sigma(G^{(i+1)})+n_{i+1}} (-1)^r = -(-1)^{\sigma(G^{(i+1)})+n_{i+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$.

Next assume that one of t_i, t_{i+1} is odd and the other one is even. Then r is even and

$$\begin{aligned}
(-1)^{\sigma(G^{(i)})+n_i} &= (-1)^{(\sigma(G)+t_i)+n_i} \\
&= (-1)^{\sigma(G)+n_i} (-1)^{t_i} \\
&= (-1)^{\sigma(G)+(n_{i+1}-r)} (-1)^{t_{i+1}+1} \\
&= (-1)^{(\sigma(G)+t_{i+1})+(n_{i+1}-r)+1} \\
&= (-1)^{\sigma(G^{(i+1)})+n_{i+1}} (-1)^{r+1} = -(-1)^{\sigma(G^{(i+1)})+n_{i+1}},
\end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq 3$.

Now we assume that $\mathcal{S}(M) = \{i, i+1\}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Since

$$(-1)^{\sigma(G^{(i)})+n_i} = -(-1)^{\sigma(G^{(i+1)})+n_{i+1}}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq 3$ as we have seen before, we have

$$\alpha_G = (-1)^{\sigma(G^{(i)})+n_i} - (-1)^{\sigma(G^{(i+1)})+n_{i+1}} = 0.$$

Finally assume that $\mathcal{S}(M) = \{1, 4\}$. Since t_2 and t_3 are the only integers between t_1 and t_4 which do not belong to $G^{(1)}$ as well as to $G^{(4)}$, we have $n_4 = n_1 + r - 2$ where $r = t_4 - t_1 - 1$. Moreover, the proof of Lemma 4.7 shows that in the case that $\mathcal{S}(M) = \{1, 4\}$, the integers t_1 and t_4 are both even or both odd. In particular, r is odd. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned}
(-1)^{\sigma(G^{(1)})+n_1} &= (-1)^{(\sigma(G)+t_1)+n_1} \\
&= (-1)^{\sigma(G)+n_1} (-1)^{t_1} \\
&= (-1)^{\sigma(G)+(n_4-r+2)} (-1)^{t_4} \\
&= (-1)^{(\sigma(G)+t_4)+(n_4-r)+2} \\
&= (-1)^{\sigma(G^{(4)})+n_4} (-1)^{r+2} = -(-1)^{\sigma(G^{(4)})+n_4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\alpha_G = (-1)^{\sigma(G^{(1)})+n_1} - (-1)^{\sigma(G^{(4)})+n_4} = 0$. Hence α_G is zero in any case and this completes the proof. $\square$

Now we are ready to prove the Theorem 4.4.

Proof of Theorem 4.4. Let us first discuss the case $n = 4, 5$. Since there is no restricted matching for cycles of length 4 and 5, we have $\nu_0(C_n) = 1$. Moreover, $\nu(C_4) = 2$ and $\nu(C_5) = 2$. Furthermore $I^{[k]}$ has linear quotients for $k \geq \nu_0(C_n)$ for $n = 4$. If $n = 5$, then clearly $\text{index}(I) = 2$. Therefore in these cases all statements of the theorem hold.

Suppose now that $n > 5$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $V(C_n) = [n]$ and $E(C_n) = \{\{i, i+1\} : 1 \leq i \leq n-1\} \cup \{\{1, n\}\}$.

(a) In the case n is even the set $T = \{\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}, \dots, \{n-1, n\}\}$ is a matching of maximal size. So $\nu = |T| = n/2$. In the case that n is odd the set $T' = \{\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}, \dots, \{n-2, n-1\}\}$ is a matching of maximal size and so $\nu = |T'| = (n-1)/2$. Thus in general $\nu = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$.

(b) In the case n is even the set $T = \{\{1, 2\}, \{4, 5\}, \{6, 7\}, \dots, \{n-2, n-1\}\}$ is a matching of maximal size such that $\{1, 2\}$ forms a gap with any other edge in this matching and so $\nu_0(C_n) = |T| = (n-2)/2$. Also in the case that n is odd the set $T' = \{\{1, 2\}, \{4, 5\}, \{6, 7\}, \dots, \{n-3, n-2\}\}$ is a matching of maximal size such that $\{1, 2\}$ forms a gap with any other edge in this matching and so $\nu_0(C_n) = |T'| = (n-3)/2$. Thus in both cases $\nu_0(C_n) = \nu(C_n) - 1$, using part (a).

(c) Let n be even. By using Theorem 4.1 and part (b), it is enough to show that $I^{[\nu(C_n)-1]}$ has linear quotients.

Let $u_1 > u_2 > \dots > u_r$ be the monomial generators of $I^{[\nu(C_n)-1]}$ ordered lexicographically. We will show that the colon ideal $(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{i-1}) : u_i$ is generated by linear forms for any $2 \leq i \leq r$. Let $J_i = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{i-1})$. As we mentioned in the proof of Theorem 4.1, $\{u_j / \gcd(u_j, u_i) : 1 \leq j \leq i-1\}$ is a set of generators of $J_i : u_i$. By Lemma 4.5, for all $1 \leq j \leq r$ we have $u_j = (\prod_{k=1}^n x_k) / (x_{l_j} x_{l'_j})$ for some $l_j < l'_j \leq n$ with $l'_j - l_j$ odd.

Let $t < i$ and $f_t = u_t / \gcd(u_t, u_i)$, and suppose that two of the integers l_t, l'_t, l_i, l'_i are equal. Then, since $u_t > u_i$, $f_t = x_{l_i}$ if $l_t \neq l_i$, and $f_t = x_{l'_i}$ if $l_t = l_i$.

Next suppose that no two of the integers l_t, l'_t, l_i, l'_i are equal. Then the integers l_t, l'_t, l_i, l'_i are pairwise different. Thus $f_t = x_{l_i} x_{l'_i}$. If $l'_i \leq n-2$, then let $u_j = (\prod_{j=1}^n x_j) / (x_{l_i} x_{l'_i+2})$. Since $l'_i - l_i$ is odd, it follows that $u_j \in G(I^{[\nu(C_n)-1]})$. Also $u_j > u_i$ and $f_j = x_{l'_i} \in G(J_i : u_i)$. Therefore f_j divides f_t .

Suppose that $l'_i \geq n-1$. First let $l'_i = n-1$. Let $u_j = (\prod_{j=1}^n x_j) / (x_{l'_i} x_n)$. Since $l_i < n-1$, it follows that $u_j > u_i$, and hence $u_j \in G(J_i)$ and $f_j = x_{l_i} \in G(J_i : u_i)$. Thus f_j divides f_t .

In the case that $l'_i = n$, since u_i is not the greatest monomial among monomial generators of $I^{[\nu(C_n)-1]}$ we have $l_i \leq n-2$, and since $l'_i - l_i$ is odd, it follows that $l_i \leq n-3$. Let $u_j = (\prod_{j=1}^n x_j) / (x_{l_i+2} x_{l'_i})$. So $u_j > u_i$, $u_j \in G(J_i)$, $f_j = x_{l_i} \in G(J_i : u_i)$ and f_j divides f_t .

The above discussion of the various cases shows that $J_i : u_i$ is generated by variables, and so $I^{[\nu(C_n)-1]}$ has linear quotients.

Now let n be odd. We will prove that $\text{index}(I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}) = 2$. By Proposition 4.8, $\beta_{2,n}(I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}) \neq 0$, and since by part (b) of this theorem, $I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}$ is generated in degree $n-3$, it follows that the minimal free resolution of $I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}$ is not linear at $i = 2$ and so $\text{index}(I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}) \leq 2$. Therefore it is enough to show that $\text{index}(I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}) > 1$. By using Corollary 1.2 it is sufficient to prove that for any $u, v \in G(I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]})$ there exists a path in the graph $G_{I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}}^{(u,v)}$ connecting u and v . Clearly, if $u, v \in G(I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]})$ with $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) \leq (n-3) + 1$, then u and v are connected in $G_{I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}}^{(u,v)}$. Suppose that $u, v \in G(I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]})$ with $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) > (n-3) + 1$. By Lemma 4.5 we have $u = (\prod_{i=1}^n x_i) / (x_r x_s x_t)$ and $v = (\prod_{i=1}^n x_i) / (x_{r'} x_{s'} x_{t'})$ where $r < s < t$, $r' < s' < t'$ with $s-r, t-s, s'-r'$ and $t'-s'$ odd.

First suppose that $r = r'$. If s or t belongs to $\{s', t'\}$, then $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, v)) = (n-3) + 1$, a contradiction. Therefore all the integers s, t, s', t' are pairwise distinct. Without loss of generality we may assume that $s < s'$. Set $w = (\prod_{i=1}^n x_i) / (x_r x_s x_{t'})$.

Then since $s - r$ and $s' - r$ are odd, both s and s' are either even or odd. Since $t' - s'$ is odd, it follows that $t' - s$ is also odd. Thus $w \in G(I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]})$. Moreover w divides $\text{lcm}(u, v)$ and $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, w)) = (n - 3) + 1 = \deg(\text{lcm}(v, w))$. Therefore $\{u, w\}, \{w, v\} \in E(G_{I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}}^{(u,v)})$ and so u and v are connected.

For the rest of our discussion we suppose that $r \neq r'$. We may assume that $r < r'$.

First consider the case $s' = t$. If t is odd (resp. even), then since $t - s$, $s - r$ and $s' - r'$ are odd we conclude that r is odd (resp. even) and r' is even (resp. odd). Let $w = (\prod_{i=1}^n x_i)/(x_r x_{r'} x_t)$. It is seen that $w \in G(I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]})$, w divides $\text{lcm}(u, v)$ and $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, w)) = (n - 3) + 1 = \deg(\text{lcm}(v, w))$. Therefore $\{u, w\}, \{w, v\} \in E(G_{I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}}^{(u,v)})$. This implies that u and v are connected.

Now consider the case that $s' \neq t$. Suppose first that both r and r' are odd (resp. even). Then both s, s' are even (resp. odd), and both t, t' are odd (resp. even). If $s' < t$, then let $w = (\prod_{i=1}^n x_i)/(x_r x_{s'} x_t)$ and $w' = (\prod_{i=1}^n x_i)/(x_{r'} x_{s'} x_t)$. If $s' > t$, then let $w = (\prod_{i=1}^n x_i)/(x_s x_t x_{s'})$ and $w' = (\prod_{i=1}^n x_i)/(x_t x_{s'} x_{t'})$. In both cases $w, w' \in G(I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]})$, they divide $\text{lcm}(u, v)$, and also $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, w)) = \deg(\text{lcm}(w, w')) = \deg(\text{lcm}(w', v)) = (n - 3) + 1$. Therefore $\{u, w\}, \{w, w'\}, \{w', v\} \in E(G_{I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}}^{(u,v)})$ and so u and v are connected. Finally suppose that one of the integers r, r' is odd and the other one is even. We may assume that r is odd. Then both s', t are odd, and both s, t' are even. If $s' < t$, then let $w = (\prod_{i=1}^n x_i)/(x_r x_{r'} x_{s'})$ and $w' = (\prod_{i=1}^n x_i)/(x_r x_{r'} x_t)$. If $s' > t$, then let $w = (\prod_{i=1}^n x_i)/(x_r x_s x_{s'})$ and $w' = (\prod_{i=1}^n x_i)/(x_r x_{r'} x_{s'})$. Thus in both cases $w, w' \in G(I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]})$, they divide $\text{lcm}(u, v)$, and also $\deg(\text{lcm}(u, w)) = \deg(\text{lcm}(w, w')) = \deg(\text{lcm}(w', v)) = (n - 3) + 1$. Therefore $\{u, w\}, \{w, w'\}, \{w', v\} \in E(G_{I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}}^{(u,v)})$. Hence u and v are connected.

The above argument shows that in any case u and v are connected in $G_{I^{[\nu_0(C_n)]}}^{(u,v)}$, as desired. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [B] A. Banerjee, *The regularity of powers of edge ideals*, To appear in J. Algebraic Combin., arXiv: 1406.0456v1.
- [Ca] M. Chardin, *Powers of ideals: Betti numbers, cohomology and regularity*, Commutative algebra, 317–333, Springer, New York, 2013.
- [Ch] K. A. Chandler, *Regularity of the powers of an ideal*, Commun. Algebra, **25** (1997), 3773–3776.
- [CHT] D. Cutkosky, J. Herzog, and N. V. Trung, *Asymptotic behaviour of the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity*, Compositio Math., **118** (1999), 243–261.
- [Co] A. Conca, *Regularity jumps for powers of ideals*, Commutative algebra, Lect. Notes Pure Appl. Math. 244 (2006), Chapman & Hall/CRC, 21–32.
- [EGHP] D. Eisenbud, M. Green, K. Hulek and S. Popescu, *Restricting linear syzygies: algebra and geometry*, Compos. Math., **141** (2005) 1460–1478.
- [F] R. Fröberg, *On Stanley-Reisner rings*, Topics in algebra, Banarch Center Publications, **26** (2) (1990), 57–70.
- [GPW] V. Gasharov, I. Peeva, and V. Welker, *The lcm-lattice in monomial resolutions*, Math. Res. Lett., **6** (1999), 521–532.
- [HH] J. Herzog, and T. Hibi, *The depth of powers of an ideal*, Journal of Algebra, **291** (2005), 534–550.
- [HHZ1] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, and X. Zheng, *Dirac’s theorem on chordal graphs and Alexander duality*, European J. Combin., **25** (2004), 949–960.
- [HHZ2] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, and X. Zheng, *Monomial ideals whose powers have a linear resolution*, Math. Scand., **95** (2004), 23–32.
- [HW] J. Herzog, and V. Welker, *The Betti polynomials of powers of an ideal*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, **215** (2011), 589–596.
- [N] E. Nevo, *Regularity of edge ideals of C_4 -free graphs via the topology of the lcm-lattice*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, **118** (2011), 491–501.
- [NP] E. Nevo, and I. Peeva, *C_4 -free edge ideals*, J. Algebraic Combin., **37** (2013), 243–248.

MINA BIGDELI, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES IN BASIC SCIENCES (IASBS), GAVA ZANG, 45195-1159 ZANJAN 45137-66731 IRAN
E-mail address: m.bigdelie@iasbs.ac.ir

JÜRGEN HERZOG, FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT DUISBURG-ESSEN, CAMPUS ESSEN, 45117 ESSEN, GERMANY
E-mail address: juergen.herzog@uni-essen.de

RASHID ZAARE-NAHANDI, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES IN BASIC SCIENCES (IASBS), GAVA ZANG, 45195-1159 ZANJAN 45137-66731 IRAN
E-mail address: rashidzn@iasbs.ac.ir